



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,560	01/04/2002	Eyal Dotan	8221-84872	7101

7590

04/10/2003

Welsh & Katz, Ltd.
Eric D. Cohen
22nd Floor
120 South Riverside Plaza
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

SEAL, JAMES

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

5

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/037,560

Applicant(s)

DOTAN, EYAL

Examiner

James Seal

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to applicant's correspondence of 4 January 2002.
2. IDS has been considered and a signed copy is returned with this action.
3. Claims 1-21 are pending.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: There are a number of typos in the specification, for example, page 2, line 17 "each file *to for* each virus signatures", page 9 line 12 "carried out taking into *ccount* the" are listed as examples of several typos. Applicant is responsible for proof reading application.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-2 and 13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tajalli et. al. US 531359 A.
6. As per claim 1, the limitation of forming a least two trust group (sets) within a computer is disclosed by Tajalli (Column 6, lines 32-35; 50-53). Tajalli groups programs into High Integrity (most trusted because they are stored on a protected media), approved applications, and unapproved applications (Column 6, 27-30; 40-41; 56-59). Objects and processes are assigned these groups "regardless of the privileges or

Art Unit: 2131

attributes given to the application program or ordinary user by the underlying operating system" (Column 6, lines 2-4). This prevent hostile code (viruses and Trojan horses) from creating modified versions of itself (Column 7, 60-63). Tajalli also institutes a controlled execution CE system which prevent users and application programs from executing any application program which is not an approved application program (Column 7, lines 17-20) that is, the CE checks to see if a program is approved before it allows execute. Claim 1 is rejected.

7. As per claim 2, the limitation of assigning a program upon its creation to a trust group is explicit in as all programs are classed either trusted (HI) and protected, approved, or unapproved (Column 6, columns 20-60). Tajalli makes a comparison based upon trust level when a program is created (Column 7, lines 17-20). Claim 2 is rejected.

8. As per claim 13, the limitation of a computer with object and processes is disclosed by Tajalli (Column 8, 56-58; Column 7, line 54) assigns one or more trust group irrespective of the rights of a user Tajalli (Column 6, 1-8). A controller configured to access table and allow an operation of process over an object or a second process is disclosed by Tajalli according to a comparison of the trust groups (Column 6, lines 17-23; Column 7, lines 49-51). Claim 13 is rejected.

9. As per claim 14, the limitation of a table of types is disclosed by Tajalli (Column 7, lines 17-20). Tajalli to determine whether an application program is approved or not, thus it would have to have access to list (table) of approved programs (and possible unapproved programs) to make such a determination which is stored in protected

Art Unit: 2131

memory (Column 6, lines 39-42; Column 10, lines 14-23 and 54-62). Claim 14 is rejected.

10. As per claims 15 and 16, the limitation that the storage is non-volatile memory is disclosed by Tajalli (Column 10, line 15-20). Claims 15 and 16 are rejected.

11. As per claim 17, the limitation of table of rules wherein controller access such rules is disclosed by Tajalli (Column 17, line 32-34). Claim 17 is rejected.

12. As per claim 18, the limitation that the rules table is stored in a non-volatile memory is disclosed by Tajalli (Column 17, lines 32-37; Column 10, lines 14-23 and 54-62).

13. As per claim 19, the limitation of a network in which the network include a server, is disclosed by Tajalli (Column 2, lines 5-9). Claim 19 is rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 3-12 and 20-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajalli as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Munroe EP 0472487 A2.

16. As per claims 3-6, the limitations of changing trust group of the process after such an operation assigning, Tajalli is silent. Munroe discloses the assignment of process/object to domains (trust groups), and further establishes a hierarchical domain levels such that upon creation of a process if the domain attributes are the same or if

*Art Unit: 2131

the procedure will execute in the domain of the task that called it (Column 7, lines 20-58; Column 8, line 1). Munroe notes that a hierarchical system is preferable because there is a balance between security and flexibility and incorporating a hierarchical domain structure. Thus one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to increase the flexibility of the Tajalli by incorporating a domain structure. Claims 3-6 are rejected.

17. As per claims 7 and 8, the limitations that the trust groups are hierarchically ordered (Column 6, lines 10-12), allowing task (operation) when the domain (trust group) of the process is higher or equal in the hierarchy (Column 6, lines 17-23), denying (no allowing) the task if the trust group of the process is lower on the hierarchy than the trust group of the object or second process (Column 4, lines 20-26; Figure 5). Claims 7 and 8 are rejected.

18. As per claim 9, the limitation of defining at least two types (as defined of object is disclosed by Munroe and assigning objects to types (Column 5, lines 53-58; Column 6 line 1) and allowing operation over an object is further carried out according to type (Column 6, lines 28-44). Claim 9 is rejected.

19. As per claims 10 and 11, the limitation of defining two types of processes and assigning type and allowing the process to execute based on type is disclosed by Munroe (Column 7, lines 24-32). Claims 10 and 11 are rejected.

20. As per claim 12, the limitation of defining at least two types of storage method and assigning trust group to a type of storage message is disclosed by Tajalli (Column 13, lines 53-57). Claim 12 is rejected.

Art Unit: 2131

21. As per claim 20-21, the limitation that the tables (and/or the table of rules or security policies) are stored on the server

22. Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajalli.

23. As per claims 20 and 21, the limitation that the tables and security policies reside on the network server is not addressed in Tajalli. Tampering by the user is a concern of Tajalli (see Column 10, lines 15-25). The examiner takes official notice that security policies are placed on the network server. Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by Tajalli's concern and which is well known in the art to have implement Tajalli system on a network through the network service, by installing the tables and rules on the server for protection. Claims 20-21 are rejected.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Seal whose telephone number is 703 308 4562. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gail Hayes can be reached on 703 305 9711. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 746 7239 for regular communications and 703 746 7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 3900.

Application/Control Number: 10/037,560
Art Unit: 2131

Page 7

JWS

Jws
April 2, 2003

Gail Hayes

GAIL HAYES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100